arXiv:0905.1059v3 [quant-ph] 15 Jul 2010

New quantum caps in $PG(4,4)$

Daniele Bartoli, Stefano Marcugini, Fernanda Pambianco

Abstract

Calderbank, Rains, Shor and Sloane (see [9]) showed that error-correction is possible in the context of quantum computations. Quantum stabilizer codes are a class of additive quaternary codes in binary projective spaces, which are self-orthogonal with respect to the symplectic form. A geometric description is given in [6], where also the notion of quantum cap is introduced. Quantum caps correspond to the special case of quantum stabilizer codes of distance $d = 4$ when the code is linear over $GF(4)$. In the present paper we review the translation from quantum error-correction to symplectic geometry and study quantum codes in $PG(4,4)$. We already know that in $PG(4,4)$ there exist quantum caps of sizes $10, 12, 14 - 27, 29, 31, 33, 35$ (see [22]), of size 40 (see [8]) and 41 (see [7]). In this paper we presents quantum caps, complete and incomplete, of different sizes and in particular construct complete quantum caps with 36 and 38 points. Moreover we also show that there are only two examples of non equivalent quantum caps of size 10 and five of size 12; we prove by exhaustive search that no $11, 37, 39$-quantum caps exist. Besides we show that 20 is the minimum size of the complete caps in PG(4,4) (see [1], [3] and [4]) and that a 20-complete cap is quantic.

1 Introduction

In the second half of 20-th Century the new frontiers of modern physics led to the introduction of new ideas in information theory. In particular quantum mechanics has given rise to the concept of quantum information.

Our aim is to determine the spectrum of quantum caps in $PG(4,4)$, which correspond to special linear quantum codes.

Quantum mechanics is based on the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, which is expressed by the formula

$$\Delta x \Delta y \geq \frac{h}{4\pi},$$

where Δx is the error over the position of an elementary particle, Δy is the error over the momentum and h is the Planck constant.
The principle states that it is not possible to know at the same time and with absolute precision the speed and the position of an elementary particle, like the electron.
The fundamental unit of quantum information is the *quantum bit* (qubit), which is like a two states physical system (0 and 1) on which the superposition principle acts. This principle states that more than one state is present in the system at the same time. Physically a qubit is a two state quantum system, like the electron spin (up and down).
The idea of using quantum mechanical effects to perform computations was first introduced by Feyman in the 1980s [14], when he discovered that classical computers could not simulate all the aspects of quantum physics efficiently.
In 1982 Wooters and Zurek [23] showed that there exists no quantum procedure to duplicate information contained in a qubit. In fact if it were possible, one could determine for example the polarization of a photon, by first producing a beam of identically polarized copies and then measuring the Stokes parameters. The linearity of quantum mechanics forbids such replication for all quantum systems.
In 1985 Deutsch [12] showed that it is possible to implement any function which is computable by classical computer using registers of entangled qubits and arrays of quantum gates.
In 1994 Shor [20] presented an algorithm which can factor an integer in polynomial time.
One of the most important problem in constructing quantum computer is decoherence. In the process of decoherence some qubits become entangled with the environment and this makes the state of the quantum computer *collapse*. The conventional assumption was that once one qubit has decohered, the entire computation of the quantum computer is corrupted and the result of the computation will not be correct. In 1995 Shor [21] analyzed the problem of reducing the effects of decoherence for information stored in quantum memory, using the quantum analog of error correcting codes, and presented a procedure to encode a single qubit in nine qubits which can restore the original state if no more than one qubit of a nine-tuple decoheres. It is an example of a quantum $[[9, 1, 3]]$-code.
In 1998 Calderbank, Rains, Shor and Sloane [9] translated the problem of finding quantum error correcting codes into the problem of finding additive codes over $GF(4)$ which are self-orthogonal with respect to a particular trace inner product.
A *quantum code* in this context is a set of configurations of a certain number of qubits.
This new type of codes has only recently made its appearance in coding theory: a classical code $\mathcal{C}$ is determined by three parameters n, k, d which measure length, dimension (i.e. the number of codewords) and minimum distance of the code (which gives a rating of the number of errors the code can correct) respectively.
The main problem of coding theory is the optimization of one of these parameters when the others are fixed; for example maximizing the minimum distance for a fixed length and

dimension.
It is possible (see §2) to translate the description of quantum codes in terms of configurations of qubits to a description in terms of points in finite projective spaces. In the projective space $PG(r,q)$ over the Galois Field $GF(q)$, a n-cap is a set of n points no 3 of which are collinear. A n-cap is called *complete* if it is not contained in a $(n+1)$-cap.
We call an n-cap a *n-quantum* cap if the code generated by its matrix is a *quantum stabilizer code* (see Definitions 3.1 and 3.2).
In 1999 Bierbrauer and Edel showed that 41 is the maximum size of complete caps in $PG(4,4)$ and this cap is quantic (see [7]). In 2003 the same authors presented a complete 40-cap in $AG(4,4)$ which is also quantic (see [8]).
In 2008 Tonchev constructed quantum caps of sizes $10, 12, 14-27, 29, 31, 33, 35$ (see [22]), starting from the complete 41-quantum cap in $PG(4,4)$ (see [7]).
It is not difficult to see ([2]) that this method cannot produce quantum caps of sizes between 36 and 40 in $PG(4,4)$.
In 2009 we have found examples of quantum caps of sizes $13, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38$, see [2].
Using the theoretical results of Section 2, we determine in Section 4, by a computer based search, the spectrum of size of quantum caps in $PG(4,4)$ (and therefore of pure linear quantum $[[n, n-10, 4]]$-codes) proving that there exist no examples of quantum caps of sizes 11, 37 and 39. Then we proved the following:

Theorem 1.1. *If $\mathcal{K} \subset PG(4,4)$ is a quantum cap, then $10 \leq |\mathcal{K}| \leq 41$, with $|\mathcal{K}| \neq 11, 37, 39$.*

With the same means we prove that the minimum size of complete caps in $PG(4,4)$ is 20. In the search for quantum caps we have utilized theoretical results (see Section 2) and a searching algorithm (see Section 4).
In Section 2 we start from the physical description of quantum codes in order to better understand their mathematical definition in terms of classical coding theory. In Section 3 we give some theoretical results which have been utilized in the computer-based research of quantum caps in $PG(4,4)$ (see §4.1).

In Section 4.2 we present the spectrum of linear pure quantum codes of type $[[n, n-10, 4]]$ and determine the minimum size of complete caps in $PG(4,4)$.

2 From physical to mathematical description of quantum codes

In the context of quantum physics a *quantum code* is a set of configurations of a certain number of qubits. All the physical features of quantum codes can be translated into a

mathematical setting. For this purpose a qubit can be considered as an element of a two dimensional complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. The two qubit base-states (*kets*) are

$$|0\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } |1\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

A general qubit is a linear combination of the two base-states, as $\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$, where α and β are complex numbers such that $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$. Previous notation represents the superposition principle of the base-states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$.
In general we can consider a system of n qubits as an element of the n times tensorial product of $\mathcal{H}$. A quantum code $\mathcal{C}$ is determined by a set of particular base-configurations of some qubits (for example n). Since qubits behave totally differently from classical bits, Nielsen and Chuang [18] summarize three difficulties in quantum error correction (see also [19]):

1. measurement destroys informations: in fact it is not possible to know the phases α and β of a single qubit. If we do a measurement, we obtain 0 with probability $|\alpha|^2$ and 1 with probability $|\beta|^2$;

2. *No cloning theorem* states that no quantic procedure to duplicate informations exists;

3. qubit errors are a *continuum*.

To solve the first problem some techniques similar to the syndromes in classic coding theory are utilized; to solve the second problem we embed the configurations of qubits in Hilbert space of larger dimension; to solve the third problem we consider errors as operators in Hilbert spaces.
In particular one way to solve the problem that qubit errors are a continuum is to view a single error like an operator in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, i.e. a (2×2)-complex matrix. As a quantum code is a set of particular base-configurations of n qubits, we can view an error like the tensorial product of n operators, each of them acting on a single qubit. Each single operator is the linear combination of the *Pauli matrices*:

$$\mathbb{I} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \sigma_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \sigma_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \sigma_z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

These matrices act on a single qubit in the following way;

Identity	$\mathbb{I}$	$\mathbb{I}\|a\rangle = \|a\rangle$
Bit Flip	σ_x	$\sigma_x\|a\rangle = \|a \oplus 1\rangle$
Phase Flip	σ_z	$\sigma_z\|a\rangle = (-1)^a\|a\rangle$
Bit and Phase Flip	σ_y	$\sigma_y\|a\rangle = i(-1)^a\|a \oplus 1\rangle$

Then we can give now a description of errors using a finite set of base-errors and not a *continuum*. In the following if E is an error and ψ a base-codeword, $E|\psi$ represents the error-operator E acting on ψ. We can demonstrate that the set of all the error-operators is a vectorial space and that a quantum code with base-codewords ψ_i and errors E_a must satisfy the equations

$$\langle\psi_i|E_a^H, E_b|\psi_j\rangle = 0 \quad \forall i \neq j \qquad \text{and} \qquad \langle\psi_i|E_a^H, E_b|\psi_i\rangle = \langle\psi_j|E_a^H, E_b|\psi_j\rangle \quad \forall i, j,$$

where $\langle , \rangle$ is the inner product in the considered Hilbert space and E^H is the Hermitian matrix of E. It can also be proved (see [5] and [17]) that the above equations are equivalent to

$$\langle\psi_i|E_a^H, E_b|\psi_j\rangle = C_{ab}\delta_{ij} \quad \forall i, j, \tag{1}$$

where ψ_i and ψ_j are all the possible base-codewords, E_a and E_b are errors, C_{ab} does not depend on i and j and δ is the Kronecker symbol. These conditions are also sufficient for the existence of a code and a set of errors which respect the uncertainty principle.
The most utilized quantum codes are the *quantum stabilizer codes*. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a set of possible quantic configurations of n qubits. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the set of all error-operators and let

$$\mathcal{S} = \{E \in \mathcal{G} \mid E|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle \ \forall \psi \in \mathcal{C}\},$$

be the set of the operators which fix all the codewords. In particular all the codewords are eigenvectors of each error-operator whit eigenvalue 1. In general, the stabilizer $\mathcal{S}$ is an abelian subgroup of $\mathcal{G}$ and the code $\mathcal{C}$ is the space of the vectors fixed by $\mathcal{S}$.
If we take two generic Pauli matrices, they can only commute or anticommute and therefore it is easy to see that each error-operator, which is the tensorial product of Pauli matrices, can only commute or anticommute too.
Let E be an error-operator which anticommutes with a certain $M \in \mathcal{S}$ (i.e. $ME + EM = 0$). Then we have $ME|\psi_i\rangle = -EM|\psi_i\rangle = -E|\psi_i\rangle$, as M fixes every codeword. As $E|\psi_i\rangle$ is an eigenvector with eigenvalue -1 of M, then $E|\psi_i\rangle$ is not a codeword and there has been an error. Otherwise if E commutes with any element $M \in \mathcal{S}$, then $ME|\psi_i\rangle = EM|\psi_i\rangle = E|\psi_i\rangle$ and it is not possible to know if any error occurred, as $E|\psi_i\rangle$ is an eigenvector of M with eigenvalue 1 (like the other codewords). It is possible to demonstrate (see [5] and [17]) that a set of base-state configurations of a certain number of qubits $\mathcal{C}$ and a set of error-operators $\mathcal{E}$ such that each $E = E_a^H E_b$ anticommutes with some $M \in \mathcal{S}$, with $E_a, E_b \in \mathcal{E}$, verify the equations 1 and then $\mathcal{C}$ defines a quantum code which corrects each error of $\mathcal{E}$. However it is not possible to correct the error-operators which commute with all the elements of $\mathcal{S}$. Let $C(\mathcal{S})$ be the set of all the operators which commute with the elements of $\mathcal{S}$ and $N(\mathcal{S}) = \{\omega \mid \omega\mathcal{S}\omega^{-1} = \mathcal{S}\}$. We can demonstrate that the two sets are the same and the stabilizer quantum code can

correct all the errors of the set $\mathcal{E}$, such that $E_a^H E_b \in \mathcal{S} \cup (\mathcal{G} \setminus N(\mathcal{S}))\ \forall E_a, E_b \in \mathcal{E}$.
If the quantum code $\mathcal{C}$ encodes k qubits to n qubits, then a set of generators for its stabilizer has size $n-k$. We can also translate each Pauli matrix to an element of $GF(2)^2$: $\sigma_x \to 10$, $\sigma_y \to 11$, $\sigma_z \to 01$ and $\mathbb{I} \to 00$. This translation has the property that two Pauli matrices commute iff the symplectic product (i.e. $f((x_1,y_1),(x_2,y_2)) = x_1y_2 + x_2y_1 \in GF(2)$) of their translations is equal to 0, and anticommute if and only if the symplectic product is equal to 1. A generic operator in $\mathcal{S}$ is the tensorial product of Pauli matrices and the product of two operators is:

$$(A_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes A_n) \times (B_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes B_n) = (A_1 \times B_1) \otimes \ldots \otimes (A_n \times B_n),$$

by the properties of tensorial product, where A_i and B_j are the matrices corresponding to base-errors $\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z, \mathbb{I}$. The product is then

$$(A_1 \times B_1) \otimes \ldots \otimes (A_n \times B_n) = (-1)^k (B_1 \times A_1) \otimes \ldots \otimes (B_n \times A_n),$$

where k is the number of times that a single base-error anticommutes. Two operators commute iff the number of indices corresponding to Pauli matrices which anticommute is even and viceversa they anticommute iff this number is odd.
If we consider $\mathbf{F} = GF(2)$ and $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{F}^{2n}$, we can represent each element ω of $\mathbf{V}$ like

$$\omega = (x_1y_1, x_2y_2, \ldots, x_ny_n) \quad \text{with} \quad x_i, y_i \in \mathbf{F} \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, n.$$

In general we define *symplectic form* the function $\Phi : \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{F}$ defined by

$$\Phi(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \Phi((x_{1,1}y_{1,1}, x_{1,2}y_{1,2}, \ldots, x_{1,n}y_{1,n}), (x_{2,1}y_{2,1}, x_{2,2}y_{2,2}, \ldots, x_{2,n}y_{2,n})) =$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_{1,i}y_{2,i} - y_{1,i}x_{2,i})$$

The symplectic form satisfies:

$$f(\alpha_1 x_1 + \alpha_2 x_2, y) = \alpha_1 f(x_1, y) + \alpha_2 f(x_2, y), \quad f(y,x) = -f(x,y), \quad f(x,x) = 0.$$

We can see that two error-operators commute or anticommute if the symplectic product of the respective translations is equal to 0 or 1.
Then we can build a matrix whose rows are obtained by translating the generators of the stabilizer of a quantum code $\mathcal{C}$. If this code encodes k qubits in n qubits, the matrix is a $(n-k, 2n)$-binary matrix and the rows are orthogonal to each other with respect to the symplectic form. There exist some elements which are not linear combination of matrix's

rows (i.e. they are not elements of $\mathcal{S}$) that commute with every rows: they are elements of $N(\mathcal{S})\setminus\mathcal{S}$. As we have seen above they are not correctable by the code. We can indicate $N(\mathcal{S})$ with $\mathcal{C}^{\perp}$, because in this set there are all the elements which are orthogonal with respect to the symplectic form to all the elements of $\mathcal{S}$.

3 Theoretical background

A linear q-ary $[n,k]$-code $\mathcal{C}$ is a k-dimensional subspace of $GF(q)^n$. A q-linear q^m-ary $[n,k]$-code is a km-dimensional $GF(q)$-subspace of $GF(q)^{mn}$. In particular an *additive* code $\mathcal{C}$ over $GF(4)$ is a subset of $GF(4)^n$ closed under addition. By the above considerations this definition follows (see [1] and [9]):

Definition 3.1. A *quaternary quantum stabilizer code* is an additive quaternary code $\mathcal{C}$ contained in its dual $\mathcal{C}^{\perp}$, where the duality is with respect to the symplectic form (see § 2).

In particular:

Definition 3.2. A quantum code $\mathcal{C}$ with parameters n,k,d ($[[n,k,d]]$-code), where $k>0$, is a quaternary quantum stabilizer code of binary dimension $n-k$ satisfying the following: any codeword of $\mathcal{C}^{\perp}$ having weight at most $d-1$ is in $\mathcal{C}$.
The code is *pure* if $\mathcal{C}^{\perp}$ does not contain codewords of weight $< d$, equivalently if $\mathcal{C}^{\perp}$ has strength $t \geq d-1$.
An $[[n,0,d]]$-code $\mathcal{C}$ is a self-dual quaternary quantum stabilizer code of strength $t=d-1$.

If we describe an $[[n,k,d]]$-code $\mathcal{C}$ by a generator matrix, we can consider each of the n coordinate sections containing 2 columns. A generator matrix is for example the following:

$$\begin{pmatrix} P_{1,1}Q_{1,1} & P_{1,2}Q_{1,2} & \dots & P_{1,n}Q_{1,n} \\ P_{2,1}Q_{2,1} & P_{2,2}Q_{2,2} & \dots & P_{2,n}Q_{2,n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ P_{n-k,1}Q_{n-k,1} & P_{n-k,2}Q_{n-k,2} & \dots & P_{n-k,n}Q_{n-k,n} \end{pmatrix}$$

with $P_{i,j}, Q_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \ \forall i = 1,\dots,n-k \quad j = 1,\dots,n$.
We can view each column as a point in the binary projective space $PG(n-k-1,2)$. Hence the geometric description of the quantum code is in terms of a system of n lines (*codelines*) generated by the n pairs of points. However it is possible that the 0-column occurs and that two different columns in the same coordinate section are identical.
For a more detailed introduction to quantum codes see in particular [6], [17] and [19].
The following theorem gives a first geometrical description of quantum codes.

Theorem 3.3. *The following are equivalent:*

- *a* pure *quantum* $[[n, n-m, t+1]]_2$*-code;*
- *a set of* n *lines in* $PG(m-1,2)$ *any* t *of which are in general position and such that for each* **secundum** S *(subspace of codimension 2) the number of lines which are skew to* S *is even.*

Proof. Let x and y two codewords, $x = A_{h_1} + \ldots + A_{h_{j_1}}$ and $y = A_{i_1} + \ldots + A_{i_{j_2}}$, where A_h is the h-th row of the generator matrix. We can associate to them two hyperplanes H_1 and H_2 in $PG(m-1,2)$ with equations

$$H_1 : x_{h_1} + \ldots + x_{h_{j_1}} = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad H_2 : x_{i_1} + \ldots + x_{i_{j_2}} = 0.$$

We can suppose that the k-th entries of x and y are the pairs

$$(P_{h_1,k} + \ldots + P_{h_{j_1},k}, Q_{h_1,k} + \ldots + Q_{h_{j_1},k}) = (H_1(P_k), H_1(Q_k))$$

and

$$(P_{i_1,k} + \ldots + P_{i_{j_2},k}, Q_{i_1,k} + \ldots + Q_{i_{j_2},k}) = (H_2(P_k), H_2(Q_k)).$$

Let S be the secundum $H_1 \cap H_2$.
Let $L_k \nsubseteq S$ be a line such that $S \cap L_k \neq \emptyset$ and let $R_k \in S \cap L_k$. We can have only one of the following situations:

- R_k is P_k or Q_k. Then the k-th entries of x and y are $(0,\alpha)$ and $(0,\beta)$ or $(\alpha,0)$ and $(\beta,0)$ with $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, because $H_1(R_k) = R_{h_1,k} + \ldots + R_{h_{j_1},k} = R_{i_1,k} + \ldots + R_{i_{j_2},k} = H_2(R_k) = 0$. The symplectic product of these entries is then 0.
- R_k is not P_k nor Q_k. As the points are collinear, we have $Q_k = P_k + R_k$. Then $H_1(Q_k) = Q_{h_1,k} + \ldots + Q_{h_{j_1},k} = H_1(P_k + R_k) = (P_{h_1,k} + \ldots + P_{h_{j_1},k}) + (R_{h_1,k} + \ldots + R_{h_{j_1},k}) = P_{h_1,k} + \ldots + P_{h_{j_1},k} = H_1(P_k)$ and $H_2(Q_k) = Q_{i_1,k} + \ldots + Q_{i_{j_2},k} = H_2(P_k + R_k) = (P_{i_1,k} + \ldots + P_{i_{j_2},k}) + (R_{i_1,k} + \ldots + R_{i_{j_2},k}) = P_{i_1,k} + \ldots + P_{i_{j_2},k} = H_2(P_k)$, and the k-th entries of x and y are (α,α) and (β,β) and their symplectic product is 0, for all α and β in $\mathbb{Z}_2$.

If L_k is such that $S \cap L_k = \emptyset$, then one point of the line has to belong to H_1 and another (different from the previous one) has to belong to H_2. The third point of L_k belongs to none of the hyperplanes.
We can have only one of the following situations.

- The third point of L_k is not P_k nor Q_k. If $H_1(P_k) = 1$, i.e. P_k does not belong to H_1, P_k has to belong to H_2, and then $H_2(P_k) = 0$; moreover $H_1(Q_k) = 0$ and $H_2(Q_k) = 1$. Instead, if $H_1(P_k) = 0$ then $H_2(P_k) = 1$, $H_1(Q_k) = 1$ and $H_2(Q_k) = 0$. Briefly, the k-th entry of x is $(H_1(P_k), H_1(Q_k))$, i.e. $(1,0)$ or $(0,1)$, and the k-th entry of y is respectively $(0,1)$ or $(1,0)$. The symplectic product of these entries is clearly 1.

- The third point of L_k is P_k: then $H_1(P_k) = H_2(P_k) = 1$, and Q_k belongs to only one of the hyperplanes, i.e. $H_1(Q_k) = 1$ and $H_2(Q_k) = 0$ or $H_1(Q_k) = 0$ and $H_2(Q_k) = 1$. The k-th entries of x and y are $(1,0)$ and $(1,1)$ or $(1,1)$ and $(1,0)$. The symplectic product of these entries is then 1.

- The third point of L_k is Q_k. We can do the same considerations of the previous point and the k-th entries of x and y are $(0,1)$ and $(1,1)$ or $(1,1)$ and $(0,1)$. The symplectic product of these entries is then 1.

From the above considerations the line L_k does not meet the secundum S if and only if the symplectic product of the k-th coordinate section is 0. To calculate the symplectic product of two codewords we have to consider only the lines skew to S.
Now we only have to note that if $\mathcal{C}$ is a pure quantum code, then all the codewords have to be orthogonal each other according to the symplectic product and then, for each secundum S, the number of lines skew to S must be even. Viceversa if the number of lines skew to any secundum $S = H_1 \cap H_2$ is even, then the symplectic product between the codewords corresponding to H_1 and H_2 is equal to 0 and the set of codewords is a quantum code. □

According to Definition 3.2 a quantum code is required to be linear only over $GF(2)$. We can impose the additional condition that the code is linear over $GF(4)$ as well, i.e. it is closed under multiplication by ω (where ω is such that $\omega^2 + \omega + 1 = 0$). We can replace each pair $P_{i,k}Q_{i,k}$ in the generator matrix by a corresponding element of $GF(4) = GF(2)^2$. Moreover we can suppose, by $GF(4)$-linearity, that if $v_1, \ldots, v_m$ is a $GF(4)$-base of the code, then $v_1, \omega v_1 \ldots, v_m, \omega v_m$ is a $GF(2)$-base of the same code. Then the generator matrix over $GF(4)$ of the code is:

$$\overline{G} = \begin{pmatrix} W_{1,1} & W_{1,2} & \ldots & W_{1,n} \\ W_{2,1} & W_{2,2} & \ldots & W_{2,n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ W_{m,1} & W_{m,2} & \ldots & W_{m,n} \end{pmatrix}$$

with $W_{i,j} \in \mathbb{F}_4 \quad \forall i, j$. A $[[n,k,d]]$-quantum code linear over $GF(4)$ can be described by a generator matrix of dimensions $\frac{n-k}{2} \times n$.
Let H be an hyperplane of $PG(m-1,4)$ of equation:

$$H : \alpha_1 z_1 + \ldots + \alpha_m z_m = 0 \text{ with } \alpha_i = a_i + \omega b_i \quad a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{F}_2 \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, m.$$

We know that there exits a canonical isomorphism $\Phi : GF(4) \to GF(2)^2$ and let $z_i \in GF(4)$ be $x_i + \omega y_i$. Then we can associate two different hyperplanes of $PG(2m-1,2)$ to H:

$$\alpha_1 z_1 + \ldots + \alpha_m z_m = 0 \iff (a_1 + \omega b_1)(x_1 + \omega y_1) + \ldots + (a_m + \omega b_m)(x_m + \omega y_m) = 0$$

$$\iff a_1x_1 + \ldots + a_mx_m + \omega(b_1x_1 + \ldots + b_mx_m + a_1y_1 + \ldots + a_my_m) + \omega^2(b_1y_1 + \ldots + b_my_m) = 0$$

$$\iff a_1x_1 + \ldots + a_mx_m + b_1y_1 + \ldots + b_my_m +$$

$$\omega(b_1x_1 + \ldots + b_mx_m + a_1y_1 + \ldots + a_my_m + b_1y_1 + \ldots + b_my_m) = 0$$

$$\iff a_1x_1 + \ldots + a_mx_m + b_1y_1 + \ldots + b_my_m = 0 \quad \wedge$$

$$b_1x_1 + \ldots + b_mx_m + a_1y_1 + \ldots + a_my_m + b_1y_1 + \ldots + b_my_m = 0,$$

since $\omega^2 = \omega + 1$. Then we can associate to H the following secundum

$$S : \begin{cases} a_1x_1 + \ldots + a_mx_m + b_1y_1 + \ldots + b_my_m & = & 0 \\ b_1x_1 + \ldots + b_mx_m + (a_1 + b_1)y_1 + \ldots + (a_m + b_m)y_m & = & 0 \end{cases}$$

Clearly not each secundum in $PG(2m-1,2)$ corresponds to an hyperplane of $PG(m-1,4)$: a secundum

$$S' : \begin{cases} a_1x_1 + \ldots + a_mx_m + b_1y_1 + \ldots + b_my_m & = & 0 \\ a'_1x_1 + \ldots + a'_mx_m + b'_1y_1 + \ldots + b'_my_m & = & 0 \end{cases}$$

is a $PG(m-1,4)$-hyperplane $\iff (b_i = a'_i) \wedge (a_i + b_i = b'_i) \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, m.$
The following theorem gives a geometrical description of pure linear quantum codes (see [1]).

Theorem 3.4. *The following are equivalent:*

1. *A pure quantum $[[n,k,d]]$-code which is linear over $\mathbb{F}_4$.*
2. *A set of n points in $PG(\frac{n-k}{2} - 1, 4)$ of strength $t = d-1$, such that the intersection size with any hyperplane has the same parity as n.*
3. *An $[n,k]_4$ linear code of strength $t = d-1$, all of whose weights are even.*
4. *An $[n,k]_4$ linear code of strength $t = d-1$ which is self-orthogonal with respect to the Hermitian form.*

Proof. $1 \Rightarrow 2$. We can utilize Theorem 3.3 and the above observations.

$2 \Rightarrow 1$. Let S be a secundum of $PG(2m-1,2)$. If it is a $GF(4)$-hyperplane we have to prove nothing. So we consider a secundum S which is not an hyperplane of $PG(m-1,4)$ and

$$\omega S = \{\omega P \in PG(2m-1,2) \mid P \in S\} =$$

$$\{(y_1, x_1 + y_1, \ldots, y_m, x_m + y_m) \in PG(2m-1, 2) \mid (x_1, y_1, \ldots, x_m, y_m) \in S\}.$$

$K = S \cap \omega S$ is the greater $GF(4)$-subspace contained in S. In fact K is clearly a subspace of $PG(2m-1, 2)$, it is closed under multiplication by ω and then is a $GF(4)$-subspace. Finally every other $GF(4)$-subspace contained in S is closed under multiplication by ω and then contained in ωS. Let S be described by these equations:

$$S : \begin{cases} a_1x_1 + \ldots + a_mx_m + b_1y_1 + \ldots + b_my_m &= 0 \\ a'_1x_1 + \ldots + a'_mx_m + b'_1y_1 + \ldots + b'_my_m &= 0 \end{cases}$$

then ωS is described by the equations:

$$\omega S : \begin{cases} (a_1 + b_1)x_1 + \ldots + (a_m + b_m)x_m + a_1y_1 + \ldots + a_my_m &= 0 \\ (a'_1 + b'_1)x_1 + \ldots + (a'_m + b'_m)x_m + a'_1y_1 + \ldots + a'_my_m &= 0 \end{cases}$$

Then K is described by:

$$K : \begin{cases} a_1x_1 + \ldots + a_mx_m + b_1y_1 + \ldots + b_my_m &= 0 \\ a'_1x_1 + \ldots + a'_mx_m + b'_1y_1 + \ldots + b'_my_m &= 0 \\ (a_1 + b_1)x_1 + \ldots + (a_m + b_m)x_m + a_1y_1 + \ldots + a_my_m &= 0 \\ (a'_1 + b'_1)x_1 + \ldots + (a'_m + b'_m)x_m + a'_1y_1 + \ldots + a'_my_m &= 0 \end{cases}$$

As S is not a $GF(4)$-hyperplane, its four equations are independent to each other and then K has binary codimension equal to 4.
We know that there exist exactly 5 $GF(4)$-hyperplanes H_1, H_2, H_3, H_4, H_5 which contain K and spread the remaining points. Let n be the number of the codepoints, m be the number of points belonging to K and a_i the number of them contained in $H_i \setminus K$. Then we have

$$n = m + \sum_{i=1}^{5} a_i.$$

By hypothesis we know that the number of the points not belonging to a $GF(4)$-hyperplane is even. In particular for the H_i we have that

$$n - (m + a_j) = \sum_{i=1, i \neq j}^{5} a_i$$

is even for each $j = 1, \ldots, 5$ and then each a_i has the same parity. By hypothesis the secundum S is not a $GF(4)$-hyperplane, therefore it cannot coincide with any hyperplane H_i. We can see how the points of S are divided in the hyperplanes H_i:

- Let $x_0 \in S \setminus K$ be a point; then it belongs to some H_{i_1} and then $K' = (K + x_0) \cup \{x_0\} = \{x + x_0 \mid x \in K\} \cup \{x_0\} \subset H_{i_1}$ by linearity. In this way we have obtained $|K| + |K| + 1 = 2|K| + 1$ points.

- Let y_0 be a point of $S \setminus K'$: then y_0 is not in H_{i_1} since we would have $S = H_{i_1}$ that is absurd. Then $y_0 \in H_{i_2}$ with $i_1 \neq i_2$ and $K'' = (K + y_0) \cup \{y_0\} \subset H_{i_2}$ by linearity. We have now $3|K| + 2$ points.

- We consider $K''' = K' + y_0$: it cannot be contained in H_{i_2}, because we would have $x_0 \in H_{i_2}$, but $x_0 \in H_{i_1}$. Then we have $K''' \subset H_{i_3}$, with $i_3 \neq i_1, i_2$. We have obtained $4|K| + 3$ points.

- We have also that $|S| = 2^{m-2}-1$, and $|K| = 2^{m-4}-1$. Then $4|K|+3 = 4(2^{m-4}-1)+3 = 2^{m-2} - 4 + 3 = 2^{m-2} - 1 = |S|$ and $S = K \cup K' \cup K'' \cup K'''$.

It is clear that S is contained in three different hyperplanes H_i. All the quaternary points belonging to these particular $GF(4)$-hyperplanes correspond to lines which do not intersect the $GF(2)$-secundum S_i corresponding to H_i. As each set $K \cup K'$, $K \cup K''$ e $K \cup K'''$ is a subspace of H_{i_1}, H_{i_2}, H_{i_3} of codimension 3, a line contained in S_{i_1}, S_{i_2} or S_{i_3} must meet them. Then only the $GF(4)$-points belonging to H_j, with $j \neq i_1, i_2, i_3$ correspond to lines which do not intersect S and the number of lines which do not meet S is the sum of two particular a_i, and it is even.

2 $\iff$ 3. We consider the correspondence between a codeword and an hyperplane of $PG(m-1, 4)$

$$x = \alpha_1 A_{i_1} + \ldots + \alpha_i A_{i_j} \leftrightsquigarrow H : \alpha_1 x_{i_1} + \ldots + \alpha_i x_{i_j} = 0.$$

where $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{F}_4$. If a point belongs to H then the corresponding entry in the codeword is equal to 0 and viceversa: the entries not equal to 0 correspond to points not belonging to the hyperplane. Then if every hyperplane contains a number of points with the same parity of n, the remaining even points correspond to entries not equal to 0 in the codeword. Viceversa if a codeword has even weight, i.e. the number of entries not equal to 0 is even, we have the number of the points which do not belong to the hyperplane is even and therefore the number of the belonging ones has the same parity with n (total number of points).

3 $\iff$ 4. A codeword is self-orthogonal respect to the Hermitian product if and only if

$$0 = (x, x) \bmod 2 = [\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i x_i^2] \bmod 2 = [\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^3] \bmod 2 = wt(x) \bmod 2.$$

Then $\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^3$ has the same parity of $w(x)$; therefore the weights are even iff all the codewords are self-orthogonal. □

In this work we have looked for small complete quantum caps in $PG(4,4)$, which correspond to $[[n, n-10, 3]]$-codes (see definition 3.2), using an exhaustive search algorithm. Since the computational instruments are the same, we have also looked for the minimum size of complete caps in $PG(4,4)$ (see [1]).

4 The spectrum of quantum caps in $PG(4,4)$

In this work we have looked for complete quantum caps in $PG(4,4)$, which correspond to $[[n, n-10, 4]]$-codes (see Definition 3.2), using an exhaustive search algorithm helped by theoretical results illustrated in the previous section. Since the computational instruments are the same, we have also looked for the minimum size of complete caps in $PG(4,4)$ (see [1]).

4.1 The searching algorithm

We start from caps, complete and incomplete, in $PG(3,4)$ where the classification is known, and we try to extend every starting cap joining new points in $PG(4,4)$. The searching algorithm, in C language, organizes the caps in a tree and the extension process ends when the obtained caps are complete. Some considerations about equivalence of caps allow us not to consider, during the process, the caps that will produce caps already found or equivalent to one of these. The algorithm is described in detail in [1].

4.2 Results

First of all we have determined, up to equivalence, all the quantum caps in $PG(4,4)$ of sizes ≤ 12, finding only two examples of 10-incomplete quantum caps and five examples of 12-incomplete quantum caps. They correspond to $[[10,0,4]]$ and $[[12,2,4]]$-quantum codes. We already know that there exist quantum caps in $PG(4,4)$ of sizes $[10, 12-36, 38, 40, 41]$ ([2], [8], [7] and [22]).
Then we have proven by a direct backtracking algorithm that quantum caps of size 11 do not exist. Successfully we have established the non existence of quantum caps of sizes 37 and 39.
According to Theorem 3.4 we can consider starting caps in $PG(3,4)$ of odd size only.

In particular we consider in our search only caps of sizes 13, 15 and 17 in $PG(3,4)$, since the following theorem and the non existence of particular linear codes.

Theorem 4.1. *The following are equivalent:*

1. *An $[n,k,d']_q$-code with $d' \geq d$.*
2. *A multiset $\mathcal{M}$ of points of the projective space $PG(k-1,q)$, which has cardinality n and satisfying the following: for every hyperplane $H \subset PG(k-1,q)$ there are at least d points of $\mathcal{M}$ outside H (in the multiset sense).*

More precisely, we know that linear codes with $n = 37, 39$ $k = 5$ and $d > n - 12$ do not exist (see [16]) and so there exists an hyperplane which contains at least 12 points of the caps.
Then we consider only the examples of non equivalent caps in $PG(3,4)$ contained in the following table:

Table 1: Number and type of non equivalent caps $\mathcal{K} \subset PG(3,4)$, with $|\mathcal{K}| = 13, 15, 17$

$\lvert\mathcal{K}\rvert$	# COMPLETE CAPS	# INCOMPLETE CAPS
13	1	3
15	0	1
17	1	0

We finish our search, finding no examples of quantum caps in $PG(4,4)$ of sizes 37 and 39. According [2], [7], [8] and [22] we have proved the following:

Theorem 4.2. *If $\mathcal{K} \subset PG(4,4)$ is a quantum cap, then $10 \leq |\mathcal{K}| \leq 41$, with $|\mathcal{K}| \neq 11, 37, 39$.*

4.3 List of found caps

We list all the non equivalent quantum caps of sizes ≤ 12 and some examples of complete quantum caps of sizes $20, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 36, 38$. These examples are not equivalent to those constructed in [22], since the last are subsets of the 41-complete quantum cap. Let $\mathbb{F}_4 = \{0, 1, \omega, \omega^2\}$. In the following list we will write for brevity $2 = \omega$ and $3 = \omega^2$.

4.3.1 10-incomplete quantum caps

CAP 1

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccc} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 3 \end{array}$$

Its weight distribution is:

$[< 4, 30 >, < 6, 300 >, < 8, 585 >, < 10, 108 >]$

CAP 2

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccc} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 3 \end{array}$$

Its weight distribution is:

$[< 4, 30 >, < 6, 300 >, < 8, 585 >, < 10, 108 >]$

4.3.2 12-incomplete quantum caps

They correspond to $[[12, 2, 4]]$-quantum codes.

CAP 1

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccc} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 3 & 0 \end{array}$$

Its weight distribution is:

$[< 6, 84 >, < 8, 405 >, < 10, 468 >, < 12, 66 >]$

CAP 2

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccc} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 1 \end{array}$$

Its weight distribution is:

$[< 4, 6 >, < 6, 60 >, < 8, 441 >, < 10, 444 >, < 12, 72 >]$

CAP 3

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccc} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 2 \end{array}$$

Its weight distribution is:

$[< 4, 6 >, < 6, 60 >, < 8, 441 >, < 10, 444 >, < 12, 72 >]$

CAP 4

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccc} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{array}$$

Its weight distribution is:

$[< 4, 9 >, < 6, 48 >, < 8, 459 >, < 10, 432 >, < 12, 75 >]$

CAP 5

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccc} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 2 \end{array}$$

Its weight distribution is:

$$[< 4, 18 >, < 6, 12 >, < 8, 513 >, < 10, 396 >, < 12, 84 >]$$

4.3.3 The 20-complete quantum cap

We have also found other quantum caps by the searching algorithm described in §4.1. Starting from caps in $PG(3,4)$ and utilizing the procedure described in the previous section we have determined a 20-quantum cap; it has been obtained starting from a 12-complete cap in $PG(3,4)$. The coordinates of this cap are the following:

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccc}
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 3 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 3 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 \\
2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 3
\end{array}$$

Its weight distribution is:

$$[< 0, 1 >, < 8, 3 >, < 12, 117 >, < 14, 432 >, < 16, 312 >, < 18, 144 >, < 20, 15 >]$$

As all the weights are even this cap is quantic by Theorem 3.4. This cap generates a $[[20, 10, 4]]$-quantum code. The size of its *stabilizer* is 48 and it is generated by the following projectivities:

$$G_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \overline{\omega} & 0 \\ 0 & \omega & 0 & \overline{\omega} & \omega \\ 0 & \overline{\omega} & \omega & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \overline{\omega} & 1 & \omega \end{pmatrix} G_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \overline{\omega} & 1 & \omega \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} G_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \omega & \omega & \overline{\omega} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

4.3.4 29-complete quantum cap

This 29-complete cap is obtained from a 17-complete cap in $PG(3,4)$. It corresponds to an $[[29, 19, 4]]$-quantum code.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccccccccccccc}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 3 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 3 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 1
\end{array}$$

Its weight distribution is:

$$[< 12, 3 >, < 18, 42 >, < 20, 360 >, < 22, 420 >, < 24, 81 >, < 26, 90 >, < 28, 27 >]$$

The following 29-complete cap is obtained from a 13-incomplete cap in $PG(3,4)$. It corresponds to an $[[29, 19, 4]]$-quantum code.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccccccccccccc}
1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\
2 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 3 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 3
\end{array}$$

Its weight distribution is:

$$[< 16, 6 >, < 18, 57 >, < 20, 348 >, < 22, 366 >, < 24, 159 >, < 26, 57 >, < 28, 30 >]$$

4.3.5 30-complete quantum cap

This 30-complete cap is obtained from a 16-complete cap in $PG(3, 4)$. It corresponds to an $[[30, 20, 4]]$-quantum code.

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccc}
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 2 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 1
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccc}
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
2 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 2 \\
3 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
2 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 2
\end{array}$$

Its weight distribution is:

$$[< 14, 3 >, < 20, 258 >, < 22, 438 >, < 24, 165 >, < 26, 108 >, < 28, 48 >, < 30, 3 >]$$

4.3.6 32-complete quantum cap

This 32-complete cap is obtained from a 16-complete cap in $PG(3, 4)$. It corresponds to an $[[32, 22, 4]]$-quantum code. The research is not complete.

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccc}
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
3 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 1 \\
2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 3
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccc}
0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 3 \\
1 & 0 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 1 \\
1 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\
1 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 0
\end{array}$$

Its weights distribution is:

$$[< 16, 3 >, < 20, 39 >, < 22, 312 >, < 24, 429 >, < 26, 120 >, < 28, 69 >, < 30, 48 >, < 32, 3 >]$$

4.3.7 33-complete quantum caps

We have found these 3 non equivalent quantum caps of size 33, starting from an incomplete cap of size 13 in $PG(3,4)$. The research is not complete. They correspond to $[[33,23,4]]$-quantum codes.

CAP 1

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccc}
1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 3 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 3 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 1 & \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 1 & \\
2 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 3 & \\
2 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 2 &
\end{array}$$

Its weights distribution is:

$$[<18,3>,<20,6>,<22,204>,<24,435>,<26,219>,<28,84>,<30,54>,<32,18>]$$

CAP 2

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccc}
1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 2 \\
0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 \\
0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & \\
3 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & \\
0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 2 & \\
2 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 0 & \\
1 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 1 &
\end{array}$$

Its weights distribution is:

$$[<16,3>,<20,27>,<22,108>,<24,573>,<26,144>,<28,105>,<30,36>,<32,27>]$$

CAP 3

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccc}
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 2 \\
0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & \\
2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & \\
2 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & \\
3 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 1 & \\
2 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 0 &
\end{array}$$

Its weights distribution is:

$$[<16,3>,<20,18>,<22,144>,<24,516>,<26,192>,<28,78>,<30,48>,<32,24>]$$

4.3.8 34-complete quantum caps

We have found over 130 non equivalent quantum caps of size 34, starting from cap of size 16 in $PG(3,4)$. The research is not complete. They correspond to $[[34,24,4]]$-quantum codes.

4.3.9 36-complete quantum caps

These 36-complete caps are obtained from a 16-complete cap in $PG(3,4)$ They correspond to $[[36,26,4]]$-quantum codes.

CAP 1

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccc}
1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\
0 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 3 \\
0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 2 \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
2 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 \\
3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 0 \\
3 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 1
\end{array}$$

Its weight distribution:

$$[<20,6>,<24,138>,<26,492>,<28,234>,<30,48>,<32,69>,<34,36>]$$

CAP 2

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccc}
1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 3 & 3 & 2 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 3 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 2 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
3 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 3 \\
3 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 1
\end{array}$$

Its weight distribution is:

$$[<20,6>,<22,6>,<24,120>,<26,510>,<28,222>,<30,66>,<32,51>,<34,42>]$$

4.3.10 38-complete quantum cap

This 36-complete cap is obtained from a 16-complete cap in $PG(3,4)$ It corresponds to $[[38,28,4]]$-quantum code.

$$
\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccc}
1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 2
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccc}
1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
3 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 2 \\
0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\
3 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 1
\end{array}
$$

Its weight distribution is:

$$[< 22, 6 >, < 24, 12 >, < 26, 288 >, < 28, 288 >, < 30, 372 >, < 32, 3 >, < 36, 48 >, < 38, 6 >]$$

4.4 Minimum size of complete caps in $PG(4, 4)$

As we have already said, since the computational instruments are the same, we also searched for the minimum size of complete caps in $PG(4, 4)$. For this research the smallest size of the caps in $PG(3, 4)$ considered is 8, since Theorem 4.1 and the non existence of particular linear codes.
More precisely, we know that the minimum size of complete caps in $PG(4, 4)$ is at least 19 (see [10] and [11]) and linear codes with $n \geq 19$, $k = 5$ and $d \geq n - 8$ do not exist (see [16]), so there exists an hyperplane which contains at least 8 points of the caps.
We have searched exhaustively complete caps of size 19. As the research has not given results and 20-complete caps exist (see [13]), we have proven the following (see [3]):

Theorem 4.3. *The minimum size of complete caps in $PG(4, 4)$ is 20.*

In particular we have found a new example of 20 complete cap (see § 4.3.3) which is quantic.

References

[1] D. Bartoli, Quantum codes and related geometric properties, degrees thesis 2008.

[2] D. Bartoli, J. Bierbrauer, S. Marcugini and F. Pambianco, Geometric constructions of quantum codes, *Error-Correcting Codes, Finite Geometries and Cryptography, AMS, Series: Contemporary Mathematics, Eds. Aiden A. Bruen and David L. Wehlau*, to appear.

[3] D. Bartoli, A. A. Davydov, S. Marcugini and F. Pambianco, The minimum order of complete caps in $PG(4, 4)$, submitted.

[4] D. Bartoli, S. Marcugini and F. Pambianco, A search for small, minimal, quantum caps in $PG(4,4)$, *RAPPORTO TECNICO* N. 12 - 2008 *Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica - Università degli Studi di Perugia*.

[5] C. Bennett, D. DiVincenzo, J. Smolin and W. Wootters, Mixed state entanglement and quantum error correction, *Phys. Rev. A* **54** (1996), 3824-3851.

[6] J. Bierbrauer, Introduction to Coding Theory, CHAPMAN & HALL/CRC (2005).

[7] J.Bierbrauer and Y. Edel, 41 is the Largest Size of a Cap in $PG(4,4)$, *Designes, Codes and Cryptography* **16** (1999), 151-160.

[8] J.Bierbrauer and Y. Edel, The largest cap in $AG(4,4)$ and its uniqueness, *DESI* **29** (2003), 99-104.

[9] A. R. Calderbank, E. M. Rains , P. M. Shor and N. J. A. Sloane, Quantum error correction via codes over $GF(4)$, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **44** (1998), 1369-1387.

[10] A. A. Davydov, G. Faina, S. Marcugini and F. Pambianco, On the spectrum of size of complete caps in projective spaces $PG(n,q)$ of small dimension, *Proceedings of ACCT 2008, Eleventh International Workshop on Algebraic and Combinatorial Coding Theory, PAMPOROVO, Bulgaria 16-22 Giugno 2008*, 57-62.

[11] A. A. Davydov, G. Faina, S. Marcugini and F. Pambianco, On sizes of complete caps in projective spaces $PG(n,q)$ and arcs in planes $PG(2,q)$, *Journal of Geometry*, **94** (2009), 31-58.

[12] D. Deutsch, Quantum theory, the Church-Turing principle and the universal quantum computer, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A 400, 97 (1985).

[13] G. Faina and F. Pambianco, On the spectrum of the values k for which a complete k-cap in $PG(n,q)$ exists, *J. Geometry* **62** (1998), 84-98.

[14] R. P. Feynman, Quantum mechanical computers, Foundations of Physics, (1986).

[15] D. Gottesman, Stabilizer Codes and Quantum Error Correction, http://arxiv.org/pdf/quant-ph/9705052 (1997).

[16] M. Grassl, Bounds on the minimum distance of linear codes, http://www.codetables.de.

[17] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, A theory of quantum error-correcting codes, *Phys. Rev. A* **55** (1997), 900-911.

[18] M. A.Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information. Cambridge University Press (2000).

[19] B. Schumacher, Quantum coding, *Phys. Rev. A* **51** (1995), 2738-2747.

[20] P. W. Shor, Algorithms for quantum computation: discrete logarithms and factoring, Proceedings, 35th Annual Symposium on Fundamentals of Comp. Science (FOCS), (1994), 124-134.

[21] P. W. Shor, Scheme for reducing decoherence in quantum memory, *Phys. Rev. A* **52** (1995), 2493-2496.

[22] V. Tonchev, Quantum codes from caps, *Discrete Mathematics* **308** (2008), 6368-6372.

[23] W. K. Wooters and W. H. Zurek, A single quantum cannot be cloned, *Nature* **299** (1982), 802-803.